

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested a copy of the “as mentioned in Applicant’s reply to the office action mailed on 08 May 2001 received by the US Patent and Trademark Office on 09 July 2001.” A copy of the signed declaration accompanies this amendment.

Claims 1, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DISH Network www.dishnetwork.com hereinafter know as DishNetwork in view of an article from Mark Lillycrop hereinafter known as Mark and in further view of press release from Hewlett Packard Company hereinafter known as HP. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that DishNetwork does not disclose “setting mount of money to manufacturer based upon usage.” To cure the defect in DishNetwork, the Examiner relies on Mark and HP to disclose such feature. Both Mark and HP disclose a capacity on demand system where, based upon the capacity activated by a user, the user pays the manufacturer.

On the other hand, amended independent claim 1 is directed to a sales activity management system that includes, among other things, “a sales activity management apparatus for setting an amount of money to be remitted to said apparatus manufacturer by said **information provider** based upon said use information inputted from said information provision terminal device.” In other words, based on the use information (which represent the information content used by the user), the information provider remits money to the apparatus manufacturer. Therefore, both the information provider and apparatus manufacturer are able to share money received based upon the usage of hardware and provided information.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from DishNetwork, Mark, and HP and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, are also distinguishable from DishNetwork, Mark, and HP for at least the reasons previously described. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 27 and 28 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 6-11, 12, 13, 15, and 29-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DishNetwork in view of Mark and in further view of HP. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claim 12 is believed to be distinguishable from DishNetwork, Mark, and HP. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 6-11, 13, 15, and 29-33 depend from claim 12, and, due to such dependency, are also distinguishable from DishNetwork, Mark, and HP for at least the reasons previously described. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3, 6-11, 13, 15, and 29-33 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DishNetwork. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claim 16 is believed to be distinguishable from DishNetwork. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-22 depend from claim 16, and, due to such dependency, are also distinguishable from DishNetwork, Mark, and HP for at least the reasons previously described. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 17-22 is respectfully requested.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version with markings to show changes made."**

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the Applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 
Gordon Kessler
Registration No. 38,511
Tel. (212) 588-0800

Version with markings to show changes made

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claims 1, 12, and 16 as follows.

1. (Twice Amended) A sales activity management system for selling an information processing apparatus from an apparatus manufacturer to a user, and selling information contents available at the information processing apparatus from an information provider to the user, said activity management system comprising:

an information provision management terminal device for collecting use information on information contents provided to a user available at said information processing apparatus; and

a sales activity management apparatus for setting an amount of money to be remitted to said apparatus manufacturer by said information provider based upon said use information inputted from said information provision terminal device.

12. (Twice Amended) A sales activity management apparatus for managing businesses for selling an information processing apparatus from an apparatus manufacturer to a user, and selling available information contents at the information processing apparatus from an information provider to the user, said apparatus comprising:

input means for inputting from a content provision terminal device, use information on said information contents provided to a user available at said information processing apparatus;

storage means for storing use information on said information contents that have been inputted by said input means; and

management control means for setting an amount of money remitted to said apparatus manufacturer by said information provider, based upon said use information that has been stored in said storage means.

16. (Twice Amended) A sales activity management method for selling an information processing apparatus from an apparatus manufacturer to a user, and selling information contents available at the information processing apparatus from the information provider to the user, comprising the steps of:

managing manufacture of said information processing apparatus, and selling said information processing apparatus to a user at the sales price of said apparatus manufacturer;

providing available information contents at said information processing apparatus, and then, collecting a charge based upon use information on said contents provided to a user available at said information processing apparatus; and

setting an amount of money to be remitted to said apparatus manufacturer by said information provider.